

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,748	03/13/2006	Claas Junghans	JUNGHANS	9385
	7590 04/14/201 IEREISEN, LLC	EXAMINER		
HENRY M FEIEREISEN 708 THIRD AVENUE SUITE 1501			LEAVITT, MARIA GOMEZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK,	NY 10017	1633		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@FEIEREISENLLC.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/528,748	JUNGHANS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MARIA LEAVITT	1633		

	MARIA LEAVITT	1633			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 05 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.			
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07((b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period to under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further core (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		cted claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).		
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 8-11,22,23,25,27,29,31 and 33.		be entered and an e	xplanation of		
Claim(s) objected to: 36-39.					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>36-39</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a		
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.		
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
13. Other:					

/Maria Leavitt/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633 Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amended claim 39 introduces specific limitations, i.e., "for the treatment of cats suffering from Feline Leucosis Infection". None of the claims previously examined recited "for the treatment of cats suffering from Feline Leucosis Infection". This limitation was not previously examined requiring new search and consideration of the art made of record, and of the specification for support of the amendment. In addition, claims 41 and 42 have been added. This requires new consideration of the prior art of record, and perhaps a new search. Therefore, the amendment to the claims field on 04-06-2010 has not been entered.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments rely upon and are directed to the proposed amendments (see page 17 of Applicants' remarks filed on 04-05-2010, for example). As the claims' amendment has not been entered, applicants' arguments based on the proposed amendment are not persuasive. Therefore, the rejections of record are maintained.